

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-15 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being unpatentable over Jensen. Claim 1 is amended to include,

...a first router device...to send information to a second router device

... wherein the second router is a mobile router device **newly connected** to the local network; and

the information is **information required for the virtual router process**. (Emphasis added).

Basis for these amendments may be found, for example, in the specification at page 12, lines 9-17.

According to Applicants' exemplary embodiment, router 103 may be **newly connected** to the local network. Router 103 newly connects to the local network by acquiring information from the master router device 101 of the virtual router group 100. (Page 12, lines 9-10). That is, information is sent from master router device 101 to router 103. Thus, router 103 is "...**newly connected** to the local network..." as recited in claim 1.

The information that router 103 acquires from the master router device 101 of the virtual router group 100 may include a virtual IP address, a virtual MAC address and a priority. (Page 12, lines 11-17). That is, the information acquired by the router 103 is "...**information required for the virtual router process**," as recited in claim 1.

Jensen includes a first network node and a second network node. The first network node includes an active router 106 and a second network node includes a standby router 108. Control information may be sent from the first node to the second node which only indicates whether the active router 106 is active or not active (i.e. the active router fails). The second network node then sends a request to

route information intended for the first network node to the second network node if it is determined that the active router 106 is not active. The routing information is sent to the standby router 108 from a source other than the active router 106. (Paras. [0022] and [0023] and Fig. 3). That is, only information indicating whether the active router 106 is active or not active is sent from the active router 106 to the standby router 108. Information required for a virtual router process is not sent from active router 106 to the standby router 108. In contrast, after the information required for a virtual router process is transmitted from master router device 101 to router 103 in Applicants' exemplary embodiment, router 103 becomes "newly connected." Thus, the standby router 108 is not "...**newly connected** to the local network..." and the active router 106 does not send to the standby router 108 "...**information required for the virtual router process**," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-6 are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 7, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 7 is also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 8-15 depend from claim 7. Accordingly, claims 8-15 are also allowable over the art of record.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717
Attorney for Applicants

AR/DFD/dmw

Dated: August 17, 2007

Application No.: 10/531,888
Amendment Dated: August 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: May 18, 2007

MAT-8683US

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

153106